

that the present application is now in condition for allowance based on the discussion which follows.

The specification was objected to for inconsistencies between the drawings and the text of the specification. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended the specification as suggested by the Examiner thereby obviating the objection to the drawing.

Claims 1-9 were objected to as containing informalities. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1-8 consistent with the suggested corrections of the Examiner and canceled claim 9 without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the claims be withdrawn.

Claims 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 7 and 8 which Applicant submits obviates the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection to claims 7 and 8.

Claims 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Lindsley. In order to more clearly and succinctly recite what Applicant believes the invention should be, claims 7 and 8 have been amended which further clarify the distinctions between the present invention and the prior art. In particular, claim 7 now recites that an insulating material part has two distal ends provided with two differential thicknesses for ensuring a correct assembled relationship between two adjacent wall plates. Subject matter basis for this amendment can be found in the specification as filed on page 5, lines 5-22. Referring to the figures for exemplary purposes only which in no way limit the scope of the present invention, two ends 222 and 223 of the insulating material 22 of the pole 2 are made with different thicknesses

so that the pole 2 may be placed along the correct direction. (See present specification, page 5, lines 5-13 and Figures 1-3.)

As currently amended, Suzuki fails to teach or suggest insulating material having two distal ends provided with two different thicknesses for assuring a correct assembled relationship with two adjacent wall plates as claimed. On the contrary, Figures 3A-B and Figure 4 clearly show a pole tooth 34 which is disposed in a flange 36. Pole tooth 34 is composed of nine pieces of electromagnetic steel sheets (Suzuki, column 4, lines 28-35). Thus, pole tooth 34 is a conductor and not an insulator. Although pole tooth 34, *arguendo*, has two distal ends with varying thicknesses, pole tooth 34 fails to anticipate the claimed insulating material part having distal ends with two different thicknesses.

Moreover, none of the references cited in the present Office Action, for example, Suzuki or Lindsley disclose or suggest the positively recited feature of “two distal ends of insulating material part having different thicknesses”. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art could not possibly in the absence of hindsight have conceived of using a pole of Suzuki, e.g., pole 234, to achieve the claimed assembled relationship provided in claim 7 (currently amended).

Based on the foregoing discussion, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7 and 8 are not obvious from Suzuki in view of Lindsley.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner find the application in

anything but a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

LARSON & TAYLOR, PLC

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Marvin Petry", written over a horizontal line.

Marvin Petry

Registration No. 22752

1199 North Fairfax Street, Suite 900
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 739-4900

June 5, 2003